REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 27, 2011 has been received and considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 12, and 17-20

Claims 1, 3-6, and 11, 12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Scolan et al. (U.S. Patent No 7,058,729) Przelomiec (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,645), Sparrell (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,448) and Kotaki (U.S. Patent No 5,276,659). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "in response to the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information exceeding the threshold, communicate the first fixed code value to a second computer node to request a change in network timing information associated with the second computer node **by a predetermined fixed step value** sufficiently small to avoid loss of local synchronisation with the plurality of other computer nodes in the first network." As explained in the Response to Office Action submitted February 14, 2011 (the "Previous Response"), these features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references. The Office responds that Kotaki discloses at column 4, lines 10-48, a correction coefficient D. However, Kotaki discloses that the correction coefficient D is based on the difference between timing information associated with different network stations. *Kotaki*, col. 3, lines 20-38. The correction coefficient D also varies depending on N (the number of times a correction has been made). *Id.* Thus, Kotaki specifically discloses that the coefficient D is a **variable** amount. However, claim 1 provides that the step value is a **fixed** value, and therefore the coefficient D cannot correspond to the recited "predetermined fixed step value."

In addition, the Office asserts that Kotaki discloses a time correction can be accomplished in step-like time variation. However, Kotaki nowhere discloses that the "step-like time variation" employs a **fixed** step value, as provided by claim 1. Further, none of the other cited references discloses or renders obvious the predetermined fixed step value of claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites "in response to the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information exceeding a threshold, determine **a first**

fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information." As explained in the Previous Response, these features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references. The Office responds that Przelomiec discloses generating a fixed code value based on the sign of the difference between network timing information at column 6, lines 59-67. However, the cited portion discloses only that, if the separation between network timing codes exceeds a threshold, corrective action can be taken, such as adjusting clocks. Neither the cited portion, nor any other portion, discloses determining a fixed code value in any manner, and in particular the reference does not disclose or render obvious determining a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between first and second network timing information.

The Office further responds that Sparrell discloses a fixed code value in the form of a master synchronization code at column 8, lines 25-38 and column 9, lines 31-24. However, the cited portions disclose only that a code value can indicate timing information for a master clock. The cited portions do not disclose that the master synchronization code is a fixed code value based on the sign of the difference between network timing information. Accordingly, because neither Sparrell nor Przelomiec disclose or renders obvious the above-cited features of claim 1, their combination necessarily also fails to disclose or render these features obvious. The other cited references also fail to disclose or render obvious these features. Thus, the cited references, individually and in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 1. The cited references further fail to disclose or render obvious at least one feature of each of dependent claims 3-6, 11, 12, and 17-20, at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the above-referenced obviousness rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 21, and 22

Claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Scolan and Przelomiec. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites "an interface coupled to a first network and operable to receive a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between first network timing information associated with the first network and second network timing information associated with a second

network." Claim 10 recites similar features. As explained above with respect to claim 1, the cited references, individually and in combination, do not disclose or render obvious "a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between first network timing information associated with the first network and second network timing information associated with a second network." Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 7, and the similar features of claim 10. The cited references also fail to disclose or render obvious at least one feature of each of dependent claims 9, 13-16, 21, and 22, and 17-20, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 7 and 10. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the above-referenced obviousness rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan   June 27, 2011
Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146   Date
LARSON NEWMAN, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)